

REMARKS

Examiner Hung Bui is thanked for the thorough examination and search of the subject Patent Application. Claims 9, 11, 18, 19, 23-25, 28, 43, 45, 52, 53, 57-59, and 62 have been amended, Claims 1-8, and 36-38 have been canceled, and new Claims 74-81 have been added.

The Examiner is thanked for finding allowable material in claims 9-17, 26-27, 43-45, 47, 50-51, and 60-68. Claim 9 has been rewritten in independent form including all limitations in canceled claim 1. Claims 2-4, 7, and 8 have been canceled and rewritten to depend on claim 9 in new claims 74-78. Claim 43 has been rewritten in independent form including all limitations in canceled claim 35. Claims 36-38 have been canceled and rewritten to depend on claim 43 in new claims 79-81.

All Claims are believed to be in condition for Allowance, and that is so requested.

Reconsideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 of Claims 1-4, 8, 18-25, 35-38, 53, 57-59 as being unpatentable over Anderson et al in view of Lin et al and Akram et al is requested in view of Amended Claims 9 and 43 and in accordance with the following remarks.

It is agreed with the Examiner that the material found in claims 9 and 43 is not taught or suggested in the references. Claim 9 has been rewritten in independent form including all limitations in canceled claim 1. Claim 43 has been rewritten in independent form including all limitations in canceled claim 35. It is believed that the claims are now allowable over the combination of references.

Reconsideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 of Claims 1-4, 8, 18-25, 35-38, 53, 57-59 as being unpatentable over Anderson et al in view of Lin et al and Akram et al is requested in view of Amended Claims 9 and 43 and in accordance with the remarks above.

Reconsideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 of Claim 7 as being unpatentable over Anderson et al in view of Lin et al and Akram et al and further in view of Numata et al is requested in view of Amended Claim 9 and new Claim 77 and in accordance with the following remarks.

It is believed that the amendment to Claim 9 renders Claim 7 (new Claim 77) now allowable.

Reconsideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 of Claim 7 as being unpatentable over Anderson et al in view of Lin et al and Akram et al and further in view of Numata et al is requested in view of Amended Claim 9 and new Claim 77 and in accordance with the remarks above.

Reconsideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 of Claim 52 as being unpatentable over Anderson et al in view of Lin et al and Akram et al and further in view of Downes, Jr. et al is requested in view of Amended Claims 43 and 52 and in accordance with the following remarks.

It is believed that the amendment to Claim 43 renders Claim 52 now allowable.

Reconsideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 of Claim 52 as being unpatentable over Anderson et al in view of Lin et al and Akram et al and further in view of Downes, Jr. et al is requested in view of Amended Claims 43 and 52 and in accordance with the remarks above.

Allowance of all Claims is requested.

It is requested that should Examiner Bui not find that the Claims are now Allowable that the Examiner call the undersigned at 765 4530866 to overcome any problems preventing allowance.

Respectfully submitted,


Rosemary L. S. Pike
Rosemary L. S. Pike. Reg # 39,332